

DRAFT

15 October 1979

ADDRESSEES EYES ONLY

STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

STATINTL

FROM: [REDACTED]
Executive Officer, ODP

SUBJECT: Board of Directors Meeting, 11 October 1979

PRESENT: [REDACTED]

STATINTL

1. [REDACTED] opened the discussion of "The Value of (SAFE/ADPE) Compatibility with Existing ODP Hardware/Software" by reviewing the events that led up to the meeting. He said that CSPO will be writing an RFP for SAFE hardware in FY-80. One of the constraints on the RFP is that CIA and DIA SAFE architecture must be the same. The question of whether SAFE ADPE had to be compatible with existing ODP hardware and software was raised and led to the attached study by [REDACTED] CSPO/ODP. This study is an attempt to quantify the benefits of SAFE compatibility with ODP hardware and software. [REDACTED] said that if the Board of Directors agreed that the method used in the study was valid, then CSPO will do a similar study for DIA compatibility.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

2. [REDACTED] asked how much time we had before the RFP was due to hit the street. [REDACTED] the SAFE contractor, wants the RFP out by March 1980 but that he believes that June 1980 is more likely.

STATINTL

3. [REDACTED] said that he views SAFE in the long term as another set of capabilities ODP delivers to the Agency. As such, SAFE compatibility with existing ODP hardware and software is an overriding consideration and ~~therefore~~ attempts to quantify the value of compatibility are meaningless. Following this line of thought, [REDACTED] asked what ODP's reaction would be if a particular vendor offering non-compatible equipment were to discount his price by the dollar value we had placed on compatibility~~y~~. Would such a discount be sufficient to compensate for the lack of compatibility?

STATINTL

STATINTL

4. [REDACTED] said we should look at compatibility at a higher level than machine code execution, e.g., data standards, etc. He argued for putting a dollar value on compatibility so that the RFP could be openly competed in order to give NFAC the most cost effective SAFE system available.

STATINTL

5. [REDACTED] asked what the long term impact of a SAFE Center using non-IBM architecture would be on ODP. Where will CIA house the support people, staff and contractor, needed to maintain the Center? Everyone agreed that if SAFE used a non-IBM architecture, the number of support personnel would be greater than if SAFE used IBM-compatible architecture. The space for housing support personnel has not been raised as a formal requirement to Office of Logistics.

6. After much debate, the following was agreed:

a. SAFE continues to be ODP's responsibility after it becomes operational. It was never envisioned by ODP that SAFE would be a turn-key system turned over to NFAC for operation. *However, The details of this responsibility remain to be specified in the SAFE Transitional Plan.*

b. There exists a basic disagreement among Board members, chiefly between [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] as to whether compatibility (at least of the large mainframes) is an overriding factor in SAFE procurement, or a factor which could be quantified in dollar terms for evaluating RFP responses. This issue ^{best} can only be resolved by a policy decision from the Director of Data Processing.

c. ODP Processing and CSPO agreed to a consolidated point for the SAFE and Ruffing Centers.

7. At [REDACTED]'s suggestion, the Board agreed to delete the second sentence on page 6 of the study done by [REDACTED]

8. The meeting adjourned at 1500 hours.

STATINTL

cc: DD/P
DD/A
C/SPS
C/MS
D/ODP

13 OCT 1979

STATINTL

15 October 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

STATINTL

FROM: [REDACTED]

Executive Officer, ODP

SUBJECT: Board of Directors Meeting, 11 October 1979

PRESENT: [REDACTED]

STATINTL

STATINTL

1. [REDACTED] opened the discussion of "The Value of (SAFE/ADPE) Compatibility with Existing ODP Hardware/Software" by reviewing the events that led up to the meeting. He said that ^{SAFE contractor} CSPO will be writing an RFP for SAFE hardware in FY-80. One of the constraints on the RFP is that CIA and DIA SAFE architecture must be the same. The question of ~~whether~~ ^{if} SAFE ADPE ~~had to be~~ ^{is} compatible with existing ODP hardware and software was raised, and led to the attached study by [REDACTED] CSPO/ODP. This study is an attempt to quantify the benefits of SAFE compatibility with ODP hardware and software. [REDACTED] said that if the Board of Directors agreed that the method used in the study was valid, then CSPO will do a similar study for DIA compatibility.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

2. [REDACTED] asked how much time we had before the RFP was due to hit the street. [REDACTED] the SAFE contractor, wants the RFP out by March 1980 but that he believes that June 1980 is more likely.

3. [REDACTED] said that he views SAFE in the long term as another set of capabilities ODP delivers to the Agency. As such, SAFE compatibility with existing ODP hardware and software is an overriding consideration and ~~therefore~~ attempts to quantify the value of compatibility are meaningless. Following this line of thought, [REDACTED] asked what ODP's reaction would be if a particular vendor offering non-compatible equipment were to discount his price by the dollar value we had placed on compatibility. Would such a discount be sufficient to compensate for the lack of compatibility?

4. [REDACTED] said we should look at compatibility at a higher level than machine code execution, e.g., data standards, etc. He argued for putting a dollar value on compatibility so that the RFP could be openly competed in order to give ^{CIA and DIA} ~~NSA~~ the most cost effective SAFE system available.

5. [REDACTED] asked what the long term impact of a SAFE Center using non-IBM architecture would be on ODP. Where will CIA house the support people, staff and contractor, needed to maintain the Center? Everyone agreed that if SAFE used a non-IBM architecture, the number of support personnel would be greater than if SAFE used IBM-compatible architecture.

How much greater was not agreed.
The space for housing support personnel has ~~not~~ been raised

as a ~~formal~~ requirement to Office of Logistics but no space has yet been identified. (10000 ft² was requested)

6. After much debate, the following was agreed:

a. SAFE continues to be ODP's responsibility after it becomes operational. It was never envisioned by ~~ODP~~ ^{anyone} that SAFE would be a turn-key system turned over to NFAC for operation.

b. There exists a basic disagreement among Board members, chiefly between [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] as to whether compatibility (at least of the large mainframes) is an overriding factor in SAFE procurement, or a factor ^(among many) ~~(which could be quantified)~~ in

^{and} ~~the~~ ^{of whether to proceed} ~~decision~~ ^{of whether to proceed} for evaluating RFP responses. This issue

^{functional requirement} ~~can only be resolved by a~~ ^{direct the architecture of SAFE computer} ~~decision from the~~ ^{independently of the} Director of Data Processing. ①

c. ODP Processing and CSPO agreed to a consolidated point for the SAFE and Ruffing Centers.

7. At [REDACTED]'s suggestion, the Board agreed to delete the second sentence on page 6 of the study done by [REDACTED]

8. The meeting adjourned at 1500 hours.



cc: DD/P
DD/A
C/SPS
C/NS
D/ODP

① It was noted that the DIA question is very similar, more persuasive and based on Honeywell hardware.

It was noted that the DIA question is very similar, more persuasive and based on Honeywell hardware.

*CSPO in an open competition (competition)
the direction of the CSPO in an open competition (competition)
the direction of the CSPO in an open competition (competition)*

Approved For Release 2001/05/23 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000200090007-6

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION ON TOP AND BOTTOM					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1			17 Nov	SB	
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks:					
<p><i>Comments and/or corrections, pls.</i></p> <p><i>Geo</i>  <i>called in - OK as is</i></p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
				10/16/28	

Approved For Release 2001/05/23 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000200090007-6

STATINTL

STATINTL